

fact that more than 50 Democrats, one-third of the house's total membership of 150, did so is a sign of just how trampled they feel. This isn't a few disgruntled members sulking in their tents."

The Corpus Christi Caller Times: "Instead of seeking conciliation and appeasement of opponents, Craddick and Governor Rick Perry have chosen to run roughshod over their opposition, all but ending any semblance of bipartisanship. The other 'heavy' in this drama is TOM DELAY, the U.S. House Majority Leader, whose attempt to muscle a redistricting bill through the legislature triggered the revolt. Doesn't DELAY have more pressing business in Washington?"

The San Antonio Express News: "The Gingrichian hubris of the Republican-led House prompted Monday's revenge of the 'House Flies.'"

Now, why are all of the newspapers in the State of Texas siding with the 51 who went to Oklahoma rather than siding with the leadership down in the legislature? It is because the leadership is wrong; because they are abusing their position. They are requiring, they would require Texas to redistrict 2 years after it already drew the lines.

Now, if this were to happen, and I do not believe it will, but if it should happen, then what would prevent every State in the country from redrawing congressional lines every 2 years? That would be chaos, and that was not intended by the Framers of the Constitution nor the Members of this body who drafted legislation requiring that redistricting be done every 2 years.

Let us end this chaos. Let us restore order.

□ 1715

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CHOCOLA). The Chair would remind Members to refrain from wearing communicative badges while under recognition.

#### THE REST OF THE TEXAS REDISTRICTING STORY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as Paul Harvey says in his radio broadcasts, Let us hear the rest of the story.

My good friend from the State of Texas (Mr. FROST) from the 24th district has been expounding on potentially how unfair that particular redistricting plan that is pending before the Texas House is so I want to talk about the rest of the story.

Back in 1980, the redistricting process was controlled by the Democratic legislature in Austin as it should have been because they were in the majority in both the Texas House and the Texas Senate. We did have a Republican Gov-

ernor at that time. I believe Governor Clements. But the legislative process was dominated by the Democrats. And a map that was put out had 27 congressional districts in it. And I believe, I want to say four of them, four of the 27 elected Republicans, when all the dust had settled, in at least one of those districts was an upset; Congressman Jack Fields upset long-time incumbent Democrat Bob Eckhardt down along the Houston ship channel that was really drawn to be a Democratic district.

So we had a situation where Republicans were packed and the citizens of Texas voted over 50 percent for Republican candidates. We had four out of 27 seats in that particular redistricting process.

We rock along to 1990. In 1990 you had again a Democratic legislature and a Democratic Governor this time, and Texas gained three more seats; it went to 30 because of population growth. The next election about 55, 56 percent of the voters of Texas voted for Republican candidates, but because of the lines that were drawn, nine Republicans got elected out of 30, 30 percent were elected Republicans when we were voting 57 percent. That 27 percent Delta resulted in about nine congressional seats, electing Democrats that if you had a little bit more fairer lines would have elected Republicans.

Now we cannot stand here and tell you today on the floor of the House of Representatives that some of those Democrats that got elected did not deserve to get elected.

My good friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS), a good aggie friend of mine, he won in the district that could have been marginally called at least a swing district, but he did a good job. My good friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL), my good friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), they are winning in districts that are drawn to be Republican districts; and they are just doing a better job or the Republican candidates just are not up to snuff. That is fair. There is nothing wrong with that.

But when you have had two redistrictings done in 1980 and 1990 and it is obvious that the mapmakers, because they were controlled by one political party, which is fair, drew the districts to favor their party. And then we come along to the year 2002, and we elect a Republican House and a Republican Senate and a Republican Governor in Texas. And in the congressional elections we support 57 percent Republican candidates, and we still do not have over half the Congress seats, it is fair to say we should redraw the lines. And that is what the Texas legislature is trying to do right now.

I would say it is trying to do it on a bipartisan basis. No one can tell me that Ron Wilson from Houston, Texas, an African American who is chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means of the Texas House is not a Democrat. And he is part of this process where

State Representative Velma Luna, a Democrat, is helping to put this map together. So this is not a Tom DeLay map or a Joe Barton map or even a Tom Craddick map. It is a bipartisan map. It would elect two more Hispanics in all probability. It would elect probably one more African American; and in all probability, yes, it would elect more Republicans.

Would it elect 57 percent of the delegation to be Republican? Probably not, because there are still going to be some Democratic incumbent Congressmen who just do a good job, and their constituents support the job they are doing, and they are going to elect them in the districts that are drawn to be Republican. I do not have any problem with that.

But to stand here and say, as some Members have said before me, that what is happening in Austin is somehow unscrupulous or ill-towards or ill-founded is just not the case. We are simply trying to get the congressional districts to reflect the voting patterns of the State of Texas. And that is a good thing and not a bad thing.

The legislators that are hiding out up in the Holiday Inn in Ardmore, Oklahoma, it may be good PR, and it may be funny; but it is not what they were elected to do.

They were elected to go to Austin and participate in the legislative process, to win or lose based on where the votes are. I would remind my friends that when the Republicans were in the minority in 1980 where they did not have 50 Republicans in the legislature at that time, but certainly they did in 1990, they did not bug out. They got beat on the floor, but they stayed and fought. And I would hope later this evening or sometime tomorrow enough people come to form a quorum. If that does not happen, the likelihood is that some very good legislation is going to die, the reorganization of State government which would save hundreds of millions of dollars. The Governor will just call a special session, and we will do this in a special session.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman and I are friends, and we have worked together on a lot of issues and I thank you for yielding.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I will have 5 minutes and this is a time we might be able to exchange some ideas because I was there in 1981 and 1991, and I would be glad to talk about it.

#### AMERICAN ECONOMIC JOBS CRISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLANCE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BALLANCE. Mr. Speaker, today as we stand in these halls, we are experiencing an unprecedented crisis in our

community, our cities, and our towns all across America, as dedicated hard-working citizens find themselves receiving pink slips, they are laid off. And the big problem is that they are unable to find jobs.

This economic crisis is at its worst. In the district that I represent in rural eastern North Carolina, an area that once thrived on agriculture and textiles, both of which have been hard hit, it appears that as far as the textile industry, there is little or no hope for recovery. More than half a million jobs have been lost nationwide in the last 5 months alone. At this moment there are fewer jobs in the labor market than at any other time since the current recession began.

Since January of 2001, the Nation has lost 2.7 million private sector jobs, and the unemployment rate has risen from 4.5 in 2001 to 6 percent 2 years later. In North Carolina we have lost 130,000 jobs since the Bush administration took office; 80,000 of these jobs have been lost in the manufacturing sector; 5,328 textiles/apparel jobs have been lost in the first district alone since 1999; 32,640 textile/apparel jobs have been lost in North Carolina since 1999; 12,669 manufacturing jobs lost in the first district since 2001.

In addition to plant closings all across the State, they are leaving thousands of families in financial peril. In the Halifax County town of Roanoke Rapids, in my district, the closure of the West Point Stevens textile plant, and many of you may remember the plant immortalized as the foundation for workers' rights in the movie "Norma Rae," will put 350 families out of work next month. There will not be one yard of textile production in Halifax County once this West Point Stevens facility closes, abandoning a city on the Roanoke River founded on textiles.

Unless some long-term remedies are found, North Carolinians and, most specifically, workers in northeastern North Carolina, will face a crisis of chronic unemployment with shrinking safety nets to combat this crisis.

The percentage of workers nearly receiving regular unemployment benefits who subsequently exhausted those benefits without finding work was at its highest level ever just a few months ago in February.

The tax plan forced through this House last week included no provision whatsoever for extending unemployment insurance benefits, which are due to expire in just 17 days.

We have got to do something about this problem. It is time that we pass the bill that extended this deadline and provided jobs for our people. I urge us to take this step.

#### UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS ARE GREATLY NEEDED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, 4 months ago as a brand-new Member of this House, I stood with two of my Democratic colleagues from North Carolina at the Employment Security Commission office in Raleigh. And together we called on Congress to extend unemployment benefits for an additional 26 weeks. At that time there were more than 37,000 workers who had already exhausted their unemployment benefits in North Carolina and nationally a million workers were without benefits, out of a job, out of money and because of the inaction of this House, out of luck.

Despite my plea and the plea of other Democrats to extend the benefits through a compromise plan that the Senate passed unanimously, the House leadership allowed the benefits to expire and allowed 1 million Americans and their families to go without benefits. And there was never an explanation for why this House could not trouble itself to act quickly, to act in time to give that extension. A few days later this House did act and extended benefits. It was not 26 weeks. It was 13. Again, no explanation for why we could not act in time.

Here we are again. With a deadline quickly approaching, the Republican leadership is again doing nothing to extend those benefits.

On May 31, just a couple of weeks, this House will let unemployment benefits expire again; but this time the impact will be far greater. Now there are 2.1 million workers who will be left without unemployment benefits. Twice as many in January, twice as many mothers and fathers, twice as many breadwinners, twice as many out-of-luck Americans.

The economy has lost more than half a million additional jobs since January. Since the recession began 2 years ago, the economy has lost 2.7 million jobs in the private sector. The persistence of job loss at this 2-year mark in this recession is the worst since the Great Depression. The unemployment rate is now 6 percent, and there are 8.8 million unemployed Americans. But again House Republicans are doing nothing to protect out-of-work Americans and their families.

The Republican leadership has found the time to do plenty for America's richest. The Republicans rammed the President's tax bill through last week. If you listen to the Republicans speak in favor of that bill, you would have thought you flipped from C-SPAN to the History Channel. You would have thought you had gone back in time and you were seeing House debates during the Great Depression or the Works Progress Administration or the Civilian Conservation Corps, because every Republican spoke entirely of creation of jobs. Only in passing and only occasionally were Republicans speaking for the bill mentioned that what the bill did was eliminate dividends, the taxation on individuals of dividend, dividend income.

As the gentleman pointed out just a short while ago, we have heard strained arguments before for how tax cuts solve a wide variety of problems. The Republicans say that tax cuts to the rich are the solution for everything from urban sprawl to tooth decay. Last week it was the creation of jobs and economic stimulus. But the proposed economic stimulus bill, or the bill described last week as an economic stimulus bill, does little, precious little, to stimulate the economy.

They said that we need to cut taxes on the richest Americans so that we can create what economists call the wealth effect; that the richest Americans need to feel so secure in their financial circumstances that they then will not feel inclined to save the money, but they will spend it; and that will stimulate the economy.

□ 1730

The unemployed may not feel rich, may not feel wealthy from getting an extension of their unemployment benefits, but believe me, they will spend it. I call it the got-to-pay-the-bills effect. They will spend the money. They will spend it on their rent. They will spend it on food. They will spend it on health care costs. They will spend the money. Do not worry.

I do not favor, Mr. Speaker, an indefinite extension of unemployment benefits, but I do not believe, as apparently the majority in this Chamber do believe, that the majority of those who would be helped by the extension of unemployment benefits would prefer not to be working. If my colleagues think the unemployed are not looking for jobs because unemployment benefits allows them a tax-paid holiday, I invite my colleagues to come with me to Rockingham County. I would like to introduce them to unemployed textile workers who do not know when they will again find a job. They do not where to look for a job. I would like to see my colleagues say to their face that we need to light a fire under them so they will look for a job, and then, unless we end their unemployment benefits, they will not look, they will not go and find a job to support themselves and for their families.

I am proud to be here with many of my colleagues today, the first-term members on the Democratic side, calling for an extension of those benefits.

#### ECONOMIC CHALLENGES FACING OUR NATION'S WORKING FAMILIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CHOCOLA). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. CARDOZA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss the economic challenges facing our Nation's working families. The latest unemployment figures make it official: We are now in the longest period of job losses in America since the Great Depression. America